



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,607	07/11/2003	Peng T. Ong	AUS920085001US2	2901

50170 7590 11/27/2009

IBM CORP. (WIP)
c/o WALDER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, P.C.
17330 PRESTON ROAD
SUITE 100B
DALLAS, TX 75252

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, CARLTON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2436

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/617,607

Applicant(s)

ONG, PENG T.

Examiner

CARLTON V. JOHNSON

Art Unit

2436

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9,10,17 and 21-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9,10,17 and 21-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7-9-2009.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers filed on 7-9-2009.
2. Claims **1, 3 - 7, 9, 10, 17, 21 - 31** are pending. Claims **1, 17** have been amended. Claims **28 - 31** are new. Claims **2, 8, 11 - 16, 18 - 20** have been cancelled. Claims **1, 17, 28** are independent. This application was filed on 7-11-2003.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not persuasive.
 - 3.1 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *"receiving, in the data processing system, in response to a coupling of a separate hardware security device to the data processing system, credential information for each application of the plurality of applications that the user uses from the separate hardware security device into an authentication credential container associated with the user"*. (Remarks Pages 11-16)

Applicant has separately addressed each prior art reference for these claims limitations. (Schaeck on pages 11, 12; Cotte on page 12; and Delany on pages 13, 14)

Applicant is reminded that a 103 rejection based on multiple references is a legitimate technique according to the MPEP. The current application is rejected based on the Nonaka, Hardy, and Hall, Thoma prior art references. The set of prior art references are in a same field of endeavor as the claimed invention, generation of a

hash value from a set of parameters. A 103 rejection allows portions of a claimed invention to come from different prior art references. The set of prior art references disclose the set of integrated claim limitations.

Each obviousness combination indicates the particular claim limitation the combined reference prior art teaches. In addition, a cited passage from the referenced prior art clearly indicates the motivation for the obviousness combination. Each obviousness combination's disclosure is equivalent to Applicant's claimed limitation(s) for the claimed invention.

Applicant is also reminded that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Furthermore, in response to applicant's arguments against the reference individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Schaeck prior art discloses a view or display consisting of a plurality of applications or multiple applications. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or a plurality of accessible services or applications;

paragraph [0044], lines 1-4: user actions, accessible by the user)

Delany prior art discloses a consolidated view for the set of available applications. (see Delany paragraph [0113], lines 13-18, paragraph [0129], lines 16-20: LDAP, consolidated user based directory information)

Yasuda prior art discloses coupling of a separate hardware security device (an IC reader/writer) to a data processing computer system supplying credential information for each application of the plurality of applications. (see Yasuda col. 6, lines 5-11: IC card reader/writer read as and writes data from/to an IC card; col 6, line 58 - col. 7, line 31: once matching information is received from the client; client requests a list of application names stored on IC card; when user selects one application name; client reads authentication information corresponding to selected application; if match OK, authentication information supplied to client; perform and complete authentication process)

3.2 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *"generating, by the data processing system, a view of the plurality of applications accessible by the user, wherein the view is a consolidated user directory that contains user authentication information across the plurality of applications"*. (Remarks Pages 11-16)

Schaeck discloses a view of a plurality of application accessible by a user. Services are provided by applications. Schaeck discloses a set of services provided or are accessible to a user. Authentication information is accessed to determine accessible. (see Schaeck paragraph [0037], lines 1-5: service equivalent to application; paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: aggregation of services or applications; paragraph [0066],

lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials;
paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container)

3.3 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *removing access to an application*. (Remarks Page 16, 18)

Schaeck discloses removing access to an application. A service is provided by an application. (see Schaeck paragraph [0037], lines 1-5: service intended to refer to applications and processes; paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0043], lines 9-15: delete or remove access to a service or application) If an application is removed then the file directories associated with application are also removed.

3.4 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *creating a new account*. (Remarks Page 17)

Delany discloses the creation of accounting information for a user. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

3.5 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *injecting authentication information*. (Remarks Page 18)

Schaeck discloses injecting authentication information utilizing a scripting program as per the specification. (see Schaeck paragraph [0052], lines 11-15: script program utilizing in the processing of authentication information, authentication information placed or "injected" within authentication process via script technology)

There does not appear to be any disclosure of injecting information into a separate hardware security device. The specification discloses in paragraph [0036] injecting authentication information into the login procedure if an access script exists, which implies that a script program is used to automatically inject authentication information into a login procedure.

3.6 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *certificate enabled application*. (Remarks Page 22); *personal applications* (Remarks Page 21)

There does not appear to be any disclosure for a certificate enabled application. The specification appears to disclose certificates with public/private keys utilized for authentication. In addition, there does not appear to be any disclosure for personal applications. The specification discloses applications accessible by a user.

Schaeck prior art discloses a view or display consisting of a plurality of applications or multiple applications associated with users. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or a plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0044], lines 1-4: user actions, accessible by the user)

Delany prior art discloses the usage of certificates and public/private keys in the authentication procedures. (see Delany paragraph [0361], lines 1-21: public/private key and certificate usage, certificate serial number; paragraph [0374], ll 11-14: view certificate information (key information and serial number))

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims **1, 3 - 7, 9, 10, 21 - 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schaeck et al.** (US PG PUB No. **20030163513**) in view of **Delany et al.** (US PG PUB No. **20020138763**) and further in view of **Cotte** (US PG PUB No. **20040013132**) and **Yasuda et al.** (US Patent No. **7,114,075**).

With Regards to Claim 1, Schaeck discloses a method for providing a system administrator with a view of a totality of application accessible by a user, comprising:

b) identifying, in the data processing system, the plurality of applications (see Schaeck paragraph [0037], lines 1-5: service equivalent to application; paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: aggregation of services or applications) accessible by a user by examining the authentication credential container associated with the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0066], lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container) and

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses:

d) a view of displayer to display the view of the plurality of applications accessible by the user to the administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services

or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services))

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses wherein generating, in the data processing system, a view of the plurality of applications accessible by the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0044], lines 1-4: user actions, accessible by the user)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a consolidated user directory.

However, Delany discloses:

c) a consolidated user directory that contains user authentication information across the plurality of applications. (see Delany paragraph [0113], lines 13-18, paragraph [0129], lines 16-20: LDAP, consolidated user based directory information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck for a consolidated directory of the plurality of the applications as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

Schaeck-Delany does not specifically disclose a complete listing of applications.

However, Cotte discloses a complete listing of applications for: a); b); c); (see Cotte

paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck-Delany for a complete listing of applications as taught by Cotte. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte for realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses wherein credential information for each application that the user uses into an authentication credential container associated with the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: aggregation of services or applications; paragraph [0066], lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container)

Schaeck-Delany-Cotte does not specifically disclose a separate hardware security device. (see Schaeck paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container, credential information)

However, Yasuda discloses:

- a) receiving, in the data processing system, in response to a coupling of a separate hardware security device to the data processing system, credential information for each application of the plurality of applications that the user uses from the separate hardware security device; (see Yasuda col. 6, lines 5-11: IC card reader/writer read as and writes data from/to an IC card; col 6, line 58 - col. 7,

line 31: once matching information is received from the client; client requests a list of application names stored on IC card; when user selects one application name; client reads the authentication information corresponding to selected application; if match OK, receives authentication information and supplies information to client; perform authentication process)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck-Delany-Cotte for coupling a separate hardware security device, and credential information for each application as taught by Yasuda. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Yasuda for improving security of the authentication information in order to achieve a high level security. (Yasuda col 2, ll 49-54)

With Regards to Claim 3, Schaeck discloses the method of claims 1, further comprising providing an interface to assist in removing access to an application from the plurality of the applications by utilizing the view of the plurality of the applications accessible by the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0043], lines 9-15: delete or remove access to a service or application)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a complete listing of applications.

However, Cotte discloses a complete listing of applications. (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck for

a complete listing of applications as taught by Cotte. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte for realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

With Regards to Claim 4, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising:

wherein the user utilizing the generated view. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications), and injecting authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0052], lines 11-15: script program utilizing in the processing of authentication information, authentication information placed or “injected” within authentication process via script technology)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user.

However, Delany discloses the following:

- a) creating a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user; (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information) and
- b) authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck such that the authentication credential container is stored at a server as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 5, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4, wherein the authentication credential container and a server. (see Schaeck paragraph [0066], lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph [0051], lines 1-6; paragraph [0075], lines 1-4: authentication server system; paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose wherein the authentication credential container stored at a server.

However, Delany discloses wherein authentication credential container is stored at a server. (see Delany paragraph [0128], lines 1-3; paragraph [0129], lines 1-4: database manager, profile or authentication information under control of directory server and database server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck such that the authentication credential container is stored at a server as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the

addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 6, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the removing is performed automatically. (see Schaeck paragraph [0044], lines 1-10: data-oriented or presentation interface, data-oriented interface designates an automatic interface between client and server; paragraph [0043], lines 9-15: delete or remove access to a service or application)

With Regards to Claim 7, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4, wherein processing user account information is performed either automatically or manually by an administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0044], lines 1-10: data-oriented or presentation interface, data-oriented interface designates an automatic interface)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose the creation of a user account.

However, Delany discloses wherein creating the user account. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck for the creation of a user account as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 9, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 4, wherein the authentication information is injected into the separate hardware security device. (see Schaeck paragraph [0052], lines 11-15: script program utilizing in the processing of authentication information, authentication information placed or “injected” within authentication process via script technology)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose creating a user account for a new application. However, Delany discloses wherein creating a user account. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck to creating a user account as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 10, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising user directories for each application of the plurality of the applications accessible by the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose removing individual directories for each

application.

However, Delany disclose wherein removing individual user directories for each application. (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: delete or remove user accounting information or user directories)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck to enable removing individual user directories for each application as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a single source or consolidate view, the addition and removal of user accounting and authentication attributes for an existing group using a centralized source. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 21, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1 wherein a list of information employed by the user.

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a list of key information.

However, Delany discloses wherein the view comprises: information of keys employed by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different key employed by the user, and wherein each entry identifies a type of the corresponding key and a serial number of the corresponding key. (see Delany paragraph [0361], lines 1-21: public/private key and certificate usage, certificate serial number; paragraph [0374], ll 11-14: view certificate information (key information and serial number))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified

Art Unit: 2436

Schaeck for key and certification information such as serial number as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany in order to enable, within a single source or consolidate view, the addition and removal of user accounting and authentication attributes for an existing group using a centralized source. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 22, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the view comprises: a profile of the user detailing a role of the user, a name of the user, contact information for the user, and employment information for the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: process user profile information, account, role of user, administrator)

With Regards to Claim 23, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the view comprises: a list of certificate-enabled applications accessible by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different certificate-enabled application, and wherein each entry identifies a user name of the user and a last login attempt of the user for the corresponding certificate-enabled application. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications (certificate enabled application is still an application and a service accessible by a user))

With Regards to Claim 24, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the view comprises: a list of enterprise applications accessible by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different enterprise application, and wherein each entry identifies a user name of the user for the corresponding enterprise application. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications (enterprise application is still an application and a service accessible by a user))

Schaeck does not specifically disclose tracking a last login attempt of the user.

However, Delany discloses wherein a last login attempt of the user for corresponding entries application. (see Delany paragraph [0428], lines 3-8; paragraph [0429], lines 4-7: authentication (login) attempts (successful and unsuccessful) are logged (tracked))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck for last login attempt information as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a single source or consolidate view, the addition and removal of user accounting and authentication attributes for an existing group using a centralized source. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 25, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the view comprises: a list of personal applications accessible by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different personal application, and wherein each entry identifies a number of accounts connected to the corresponding personal application. (see

Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications (personal application is still an application))

With Regards to Claim 26, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 22, wherein the view comprises: user selectable graphical user interface elements for invoking a function to update the profile and for invoking a function to reset the profile. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 13-15: add or update application list; paragraph [0044], lines 1-10: data-oriented or presentation or user interface, presentation interface designates a manual interactive interface; paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: modification (add, update) of user profile information)

With Regards to Claim 27, Schaeck discloses the method of claim 23, wherein the view comprises: a user selectable graphical user interface element for invoking a function to delete a user name of the user from the list of certificate-enabled applications. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 13-15: delete (user name) accounts; paragraph [0044], lines 1-10: data-oriented or presentation or user interface, presentation interface designates a manual interactive interface; paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: deletion of user profile information)

With Regards to Claim 28, Schaeck discloses a computer program product comprising a computer recordable medium having a computer readable program recorded thereon,

wherein the computer readable program, when executed on a data processing system, causes the data processing system to:

- b) identify the plurality of applications accessible by the user by examining the authentication credential container associated with the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0037], lines 1-5: service equivalent to application; paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: aggregation of services or applications; paragraph [0066], lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container)

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses:

- d) display the view to the administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services))

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses generate a view of the plurality of applications accessible by the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services))

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a consolidated user directory.

However, Delany discloses:

- c) a consolidated user directory that contains user authentication information across the plurality of applications; (see Delany paragraph [0113], lines 13-18,

paragraph [0129], lines 16-20: LDAP, consolidated user based directory information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck for a consolidated directory of the plurality of the applications as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

Schaeck-Delany does not specifically disclose a complete listing of applications. However, Cotte discloses a complete listing of applications. (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck-Delany for a complete listing of applications as taught by Cotte. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte for realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses information for each application of the plurality of applications that the user uses.

Schaeck does not specifically disclose coupling to a separate hardware device. However, Yasuda discloses:

a) receive, in response to a coupling of a separate hardware security device to the data processing system, credential information for each application of the plurality of applications from the separate hardware security device into an authentication credential container associated with the user; (see Yasuda col. 6, lines 5-11: IC card reader/writer read as and writes data from/to an IC card; col 6, line 58 - col. 7, line 31: once matching information is received from the client; client requests a list of application names stored on IC card; when user selects one application name; client reads the authentication information corresponding to selected application; if match OK, receives authentication information and supplies information to client; perform authentication process)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck-Delany-Cotte for coupling a separate hardware security device, and credential information for each application as taught by Yasuda. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Yasuda for improving security of the authentication information in order to achieve a high level security. (Yasuda col 2, ll 49-54)

With Regards to Claim 29, Schaeck discloses the computer program product of claim 28, wherein the computer readable program further causes the data processing system to remove access to an application from the plurality of the applications by utilizing the view of the plurality of the applications accessible by the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of

accessible services or applications; paragraph [0043], lines 9-15: delete or remove access to a service or application)

With Regards to Claim 30, Schaeck discloses the computer program product of claim 28, wherein the computer readable program further causes the data processing system to:

- b) inject authentication information of the user account into the authentication credential container of the user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0052], lines 11-15: script program utilizing in the processing of authentication information, authentication information placed or “injected” within authentication process via script technology)

Schaeck does not specifically disclose creating a new account.

However, Delany discloses:

- a) create a user account for a new application to be accessible by the user utilizing the generated view; (see Delany paragraph [0108], lines 1-8; paragraph [0109], lines 12-16: create user accounting information)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schaeck for the creation of a user account as taught by Delany. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Delany to enable, within a consolidated view or a single source, the addition and removal of directory entry attributes for an existing group. (see Delany paragraph [0014], lines 4-7; paragraph [0014], lines 10-14)

With Regards to Claim 31, Schaeck discloses the computer program product of claim 28, wherein the view comprises the following:

- c) a list of personal applications accessible by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different personal application, and wherein each entry identifies a number of accounts connected to the corresponding personal application; (see Schaeck paragraph [0066]; paragraph [0069]: reflect user's role across set of sub-services)

and the following non-selected views:

- a) a list of certificate-enabled applications accessible by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different certificate-enabled application, and wherein each entry identifies a user name of the user and a last login attempt of the user for the corresponding certificate-enabled application; b) a list of enterprise applications accessible by the user, wherein each entry in the list corresponds to a different enterprise application, and wherein each entry identifies a user name of the user and a last login attempt of the user for the corresponding enterprise application; d) user selectable graphical user interface elements for invoking a function to update the profile and for invoking a function to reset the profile; or e) a user selectable graphical user interface element for invoking a function to delete a user name of the user from the list of certificate-enabled applications.

6. Claim **17** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Schaeck-Cotte** and further in view of **Yasuda**.

With Regards to Claim 17, Schaeck discloses a method, in a data processing system, for providing a system administrator with a list of a plurality of applications accessible by a user together with any user names and passwords used in connection with those applications, comprising:

- a) receiving, in the data processing system, in response to a coupling of a separate hardware security device to the data processing system, credential information for each application of the plurality of applications that the user uses from the separate hardware security device into an authentication credential container associated with the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container, credential information; no disclosure of a separate hardware device)

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses the following:

- b) identifying, by the data processing system, the plurality of applications accessible by the user and any user names and passwords used in connection with the plurality of applications by examining an authentication credential container associated with the user; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services));

- c) generating, by the data processing system, a list of the plurality of applications accessible by the user together with any user names and passwords used in connection with the plurality of applications; (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services)); and
- d) displaying, by the data processing system, the list to the administrator. (see Schaeck paragraph [0043], lines 5-7; paragraph [0068], lines 4-8: view list of multiple or plurality of accessible services or applications; paragraph [0045], lines 7-12: role of administrator, view of application (i.e. services))

Schaeck does not specifically disclose a complete listing of applications.

However, Cotte discloses a complete listing of applications for: a); b); (see Cotte paragraph [0116], lines 1-7: total number of application possible)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck for a complete listing of applications as taught by Cotte. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Cotte to realizing advantages, such as privacy, ease of use, and/or data communications capabilities, offered by available communications environments. (see Cotte paragraph [0022], lines 1-5)

Furthermore, Schaeck discloses wherein credential information for each application that the user uses into an authentication credential container associated with the

user. (see Schaeck paragraph [0066], lines 5-10: aggregation of services or applications; paragraph [0066], lines 1-5, paragraph [0081], lines 1-11: examine user authentication credentials; paragraph [0022], lines 1-3: profile or credentials container)

Schaeck-Cotte does not specifically disclose a separate hardware security device.

However, Yasuda discloses:

a) receiving, in response to a coupling of a separate hardware security device to the data processing system, credential information for each application of the plurality of applications that the user uses from the separate hardware security device; (see Yasuda col. 6, lines 5-11: IC card reader/writer read as and writes data from/to an IC card; col. 6, line 58 - col. 7, line 31: once matching information is received from the client; client requests a list of application names stored on IC card; when user selects one application name; client reads the authentication information corresponding to selected application; if match OK, client receives authentication information and supplies information to client; performs authentication process)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Schaeck-Cotte for coupling a separate hardware security device, and credential information for each application as taught by Yasuda. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Yasuda for improving security of the authentication information in order to achieve a high level security. (Yasuda col 2, ll 49-54)

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2436

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nasser Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2436

CVJ
November 19, 2009